IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

No. 5:10-CR-00074-F-1

| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
|----------------------------|---|-------|
| |) | |
| v. |) | ORDER |
| |) | |
| DOMINIQUE ALEXANDER JONES, |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

This matter is before the court on Dominique Alexander Jones' Motion for Reconsideration [DE-95]. In his motion, Jones argues that this court should reconsider its March 3, 2015 Order, which characterized his Rule 60(b)(4)(6) motion as a successive section 2255 motion.

In the court's March 3, 2015 Order [DE-92], the court addressed Jones' Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment [DE-91]. As the court noted, Jones was arguing that the judgment in his case was void because this court lacked subjected matter jurisdiction. The court held as follows:

The relief Jones is seeking is identical to the relief he could obtain through a successful section 2255, and for this reason, the court will treat Jones' Motion to Set Aside Void Judgment as a motion brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. See United States v. Winestock, 340 F.3d 200, 207 (4th Cir. 2003) (holding that "a motion directly attacking the prisoner's conviction or sentence will usually amount to a successive application.") Jones previously filed a section 2255 motion that was addressed on the merits. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A), "[b]efore a second or successive application permitted by this section is filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application." Jones has not provided any evidence that he has secured authorization from the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals to file a successive section 2255; thus, this court is without jurisdiction to consider the merits of the present successive section 2255 motion.

[DE-92] at 1.

Following a review of the record and the court's March 3, 2015 Order [DE-92], the court sees no meritorious reason to disturb its ruling. Accordingly, Jones' Motion for Reconsideration [DE-95] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED.

This, the 2 day of April, 2015

James C. Fox
Senior United States District Judge